

~~SECRET~~

Subject: DRACH

Source: Carl

Date: 12 Dec 1966

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCESMETHODSEXEMPTION 382B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

Postyck

1. Source met Subject on 9 Dec 1966, at 11.40 hrs at the corner of 1st Avenue and 45th Street, N.Y.C. Subject was introduced to Source by Ross as prearranged. Originally Source was to meet PAVLYCHKO as well, at the lobby of the United Nations, but owing to Source's delayed arrival and a phone call PAVLYCHKO had to make, according to Ross who went to the lobby alone, he managed to get out Subject without P. On the way to Source, Subject asked Ross whether he was taking him to Source and Ross confirmed it. After the introduction, Subject asked whether Source was working in same office as Ross and Source confirmed it. Subject agreed to lunch with Source and Ross but pointed out that he had not much time at his disposition. Before 13.30 he was to be at the Public Library at 42nd Street to see Malanchuk, and at 14.30 he will meet with PAVLYCHKO at the Mission. Subject was treated with drink and lunch at Schrafft's at 51st Street. Ross kept company at the lunch and ~~then~~ left Subject and Source alone. At 14.15 Subject and Source left the restaurant and at 14.25 Subject boarded his bus for the Mission. He ~~mentioned~~ in the meantime from his going to the Public Library.

2. On the way to the restaurant Source asked Subject how did he like Ukrainian New York. His reply: he liked young people he met in New York but he did not like the old generation. Asked to tell what exactly he liked or disliked Subject stressed the following:

a/ The young generation, particularly, the poets and writers' group, were doing positive work by creating within American milieu Ukrainian cultural values which advanced ~~polity~~ in general and thus promoted good Ukrainian name.

~~SECRET~~

-2-

These values are appreciated also in the Ukraine. The main thing, however, is that they contribute to ^{political} cultural treasures and thus promote Ukrainian interest without being politically involved. This non-involvement in emigre politics was essential because it helped them also to see things realistically and have a healthier approach to the problems of Soviet Ukraine.

b/ Subject's dislike of elderly generation ^{is} based on what he has read and seen here in the States. It is not conditioned by the fact that he stands ideologically on completely opposite positions. No, not that he took into consideration ~~by~~ his appraisal of elderly emigre generation. What he meant was the criterion of quality and depth, or rather of greatness, which he did not find. There are no personalities that would impress him by their profound qualities, except for Dmytro DONTSOV, with whom he does not agree politically but has to admit that he is a personality. In this respect the emigration is poor.

Subject did not want to say whom he read beside DONTSOV and whom he talked to, and Sourde suggested that under the circumstances perhaps they could talk about ~~the~~ political leaders in the Ukraine. Source asked him whether in his opinion there are personalities of high caliber in the Ukraine and who they are. Subject kept silent. Source reiterated his question but Subject did not reply again. Then Sourde suggested that he was going to help Subject and mentioned SKRYPNYK, VOLOBUEV and their alike in 1920's. In other words Source would like to know if there were people like them nowadays in the Ukraine not as much ^{with} ~~by~~ their political concepts but primarily of their caliber. After a while Subject replied that there are no such people. But this was a result of general development of Ukrainian affairs; in his opinion "we are in a crisis on the whole", "we don't have what we should have and the reason for that lies in objective historical circumstances". Not only the emigration but indeed, there in the Ukraine, they are ~~not~~ also lacking in great personalities.

* Subject uses "political" in the sense of "non-party"

~~SECRET~~

-3-

But on the other hand it did not only apply to the Ukraine. Things stood bad "all over".

3. The very first thing Subject did at the table was his declaration of a sort which sounded like this:

"I think I should tell you at once that our conversation won't be such as ..., well, such, you know... because, you know, I am here in an official capacity. I am a Soviet Ukrainian diplomat. This is first. Secondly, you are from Prolog, an organization of which I, you know, well, you know, I do not approve, because of your political activities. And thirdly, I don't approve of your announcements about the trials and arrests in the Ukraine, well, and moreover, you made a statement against me attacking me for my statements at the Round Table Club".

Source replied that he did not want to talk to him as ^{to} a Soviet diplomat though he did not mind it; but above all he wanted to talk with Subject, as a Ukrainian with another Ukrainian, and he was sure that under the circumstances, there was a lot to be talked about between the two Ukrainians regardless of their opposite political and ideological positions.

As to Subject's attitude to Prologue. Source would like to know what he had against it in particular. Also what was wrong with Prolog's activities and announcements about the trials in the Ukraine.

"Well - Subject started in his usual way - you know that Prolog is being financed by Americans and the American Intelligence supports Lebed". He was told about Mr Lebed's co-operation with American Intelligence not only by the people in Kiev but also here in New York, by emigres. And it was obvious even from the fact that whereas other emigre organizations were short of money the Prolog had enough financial means to do what ^{he} was doing. As to Prolog's announcements and activities in this respect (he was referring to the trials in the Ukraine) Subject thought they were not good, because they were not done properly, they were too simplified, "well, you know..."

"And on the whole we don't want to have anything to do with emigre politics, we want to co-operate with people like PRISIAK, SHEVELOV, the New Yorker group also".

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

In his reply Source denied Proleg's and Mr Lebed's co-operation with American Intelligence and any support on the part of the latter and suggested that he did not mind Subject would have a better look at finances of Ukrainian organizations to see for himself how the things stood. Incidentally, Source personally would like Ukrainian organizations to be much better off, and would not mind if American foundations and cultural and other organization would give a real help to Ukrainians. Source would go even further, namely, he would not mind Ukrainians having their friends in the American Intelligence and the US Government just as he would wish to have such friends in Semichastnyi's staff, if not Semichastnyi himself - he added jokingly - and in the Soviet government in Moscow. Source mentioned Lenin's affairs abroad, Parvus, etc. Subject listened and did not comment. Then Source said that Proleg's activities should be judged by their merits and their purpose and he doubted Subject had anything against them as a Ukrainian, and a Ukrainian poet and cultural activist.

" But your announcement ^{about} and presentation of recent trials is too simple, it is not right " - Subject interjected.

Source wanted to know what was wrong in them and what was to be corrected, he would indeed highly appreciate his advise.

" Then - half jokingly, half seriously Subject replied - I would have to sit at a table in Proleg".

Source said that he would ^{be} always welcome though he probably ~~now~~ ^{MISSION} saw his place in the Ukraine where he has to fulfil his ~~now~~ ^{MISSION} duty, but still he could give this good advise also here. What's more it was his duty. Further on, Source repreached Subject and his alike for ^{not} helping Proleg and emigration in general in their efforts to help themselves in the Ukraine. Source had no doubt that not only SVITLYCHNY and others benefited from the fact Proleg brought up the news about the trials but actually he himself (Subject) owed his trip to New York to Proleg's action.

~~SECRET~~

" It was not only that - Subject interjected - things were much more complicated. I did all I could and I did a lot but I can't tell you anything, because you know..." "Well, I know one thing, my way, the way I have chosen is the right one, and I would only jeopardize my position, my chances, and my work by doing what you suggest".

" I can't have anything to do with you, I have to hold with my people, there in the Ukraine, and I don't know why you think you helped SVITLYCHNY, I helped him too; you know in case of DANIEL and SINIATSKY the uproar abroad only hurt them and induced the judge to give them higher sentences". " I am not saying your uproar abroad hurt Svitlychay but I want to stress that I and my friends helped him too."

(N.B. Later on in the tete-a-tete conversation Subject said that "of course, what you did helped very much Svitlychny").

Subject described the way "he has chosen" as that of co-operation with the regime saying that this was the only realistic policy at the present as contrary to what others were attempting. (This was a reference to those who shared the views of the arrested.) Above all he wants to be a poet, an artist and a great one.

Replying to Source's remarks and questions, Subject stressed that he was aware of the fact that this was a game he had to play with very clever people. But he was not alone and his friends were not among the literati only. No, he agreed with Source that a KGB captain could finish them all off one day should they not have proper strength in party and KGB circles. But today, he has friends in the KGB, in the party, and everywhere in power positions.

Who are these people? Apart from the fact that he sees Source for the first time and he is from Prolog, he would never tell Source their names. But he can assure him that there are enough people in the KGB and the party to justify his decision to do common things with them for Ukrainian people and to guarantee that this policy will be successful.

To source's remark that he did not disapprove of "evolutionary path" but that this path had to have realistic elements and be based not on deception or wishful illusions, ~~in the past~~, ~~because of~~ the lack of strength and political sofistication many who tried it before had failed, Subject replied that he took all those elements into account and he could assure Source that as soon as he discovered that his concept was wrong and deprived of "realistics" he will have enough courage to draw all the conclusions even with most tragic consequences for him personally.

To source's remark that we already had had enough heroes in our history and needed instead "living people" who would, however, know what they were doing and realistically appraided their chances and the situation in which they found themselves, Subject replied that he was sure his policy will bring necessary results because even the recent Congress of the Union of Writers of Ukraine was indicating in "this direction". Subject referred in particular to the speech by NOVYCHENKO and SHELEST. The fact that NOVYCHENKO - an opportunist but otherwise very intelligent, educated, and bright man - turned completely ^{away} from his previous line and fully committed himself to the new course of Ukrainization was even more significant than Honchar's speech. Another indication in this respect was "disappearance" of TSMOKALENKO. The latter was no longer chief editor, and ZUB was in charge of editorial affairs.

To Source's comment that there was not sufficient substance in his argumentation and examples, particularly in view of other developments in the Ukraine, and that on the whole this was not sufficient to guarantee him that he won't finish even more stupidely than did SKRYPNIK or KHVYLOVYI, Subject replied that he had chances and he was sure of them to at least finish like a Bazhan or Rylsky.

3. To Source's comment that Prolog and emigration in general are ready to help "the evolutionary politics in the Ukraine" and would welcome suggestions ^{to} how to do it most effectively, from Subject and his ~~like~~, the latter did not reply. Then Source mentioned that as a matter of fact Subject and his friend were being helped now during their sojourn in the States. Subject asked whether he was to understand it as an assertion that also their performances at American universities were arranged by Prolog. Source replied that not by Prolog alone but by emigration as a whole. Subject did not comment, and Source added that this was going on while the people from the Mission were not only refraining from any real help but to Source's knowledge even tried to put obstacles to Subject's and Pavlychko's doings.

4. Asked about the status of Ukrainian nation from a sociological angle, Subject said that ~~those~~ things were far ~~away~~ from what he would wish them to be, but there definitely was ~~a~~ progress and "we were advancing". Of course, one has to build almost everything from ~~the~~ scrap, the Ukrainians' people are in need of great strength because present intellectual and political forces are not sufficient to cope with all the tasks and "national work". But today, on the other hand, "Ukrainianism" was not restricted to literary and cultural field but was also in politics, industry, cybernetics etc. This was very important because it meant that Ukrainian people were a fully developed nation. And Ukrainian potential was growing. This is one of the factors that makes Subject sure that only on the way of this growth, the Ukrainian aspirations will be finally fulfilled, and anything that would interfere with this evolutionary process would only hurt it.

Referring to the problem of ^{the use of the} ^{UKRAINIAN} language in cities, Subject said that intellectual top echelons and lower stratum of the population was definitely Ukrainian, and only the middle facet was Russified.

6. Asked about DOVHAS, Subject confirmed that he knew about her trouble and pronounced her name as DOVHAN. At one time she was employed with "Molod Ukrayny", was a nice girl, but ^{Subject} did not want to elaborate. He also confirmed that Docent SHESTOPAL was in trouble and his Ukrainian colleagues were responsible for that. Who? He did not know, probably some man like SURBIV /?/ but he could not remember this name either. Anyway, he was sure that now after the Congress of Writers of Ukraine, SHESTOPAL will be reinstated in his position at the university.

7. At one point Subject said that he was still not sure as to whether Prolog was not connected with American Intelligence. Source pointed out to what he said before, Then added that apart from all that why Subject had such a grudge against American Intelligence or rather what was its record from Ukrainian point of view in comparison with the horcible record of the NKVD-MVD-KGB? Subject replied that obviously the KGB had done much harm to Ukrainian people.

8. Reproached for his assertion about KARAVANSKYI'S collaboration with Gestapo at the poetry reading at the Overseas Club, Subject replied that he was shown various documents by the KGB and he had no reason not to believe them. Asked whether he was aware of the fact that the KGB could forge anything they needed, Subject said that of course he knew about it. As to the fact that KARAVANSKYI was in Odesa under Rumanian occupation, Subject commented that he couldn't care less whether it was Gestapo or Siguranta, finally the latter collaborated with the former very closely.

9. After Ross left Subject wanted to leave shortly after him but then decided to stay. Source pointed out at the necessity of co-operation, and synchronization of activities between the emigration and the people like Subject in the Ukraine for the purpose of helping their efforts in the Ukraine. It was Subject's and others' duty to give the emigration not only their wishes and demands but also to inform it about all

the important developments in the Ukraine and indicate directly or indirectly what, how, when, and for what ^{particular} purpose should be done abroad. Source mentioned that in this respect Ukrainians were lagging far behind Russians, Poles, and other nationalities who achieved almost a perfection by now. Stressing the importance of such contacts Source also mentioned the Document about the Library Arson which compelled Kiev to ~~not~~ ^{do} take official stand on it, the publication of Ukrainian Encyclopedia which forced Kiev to publish its own Encyclopedia, recent arrests etc. Referring to the latter Source said that it was Subject's duty to help his colleagues by giving all the necessary material ^{about them} to people abroad what he ~~is~~ and his friends in Kiev should have done a long time ago. Developing this point Source told Subject that he should, for instance, leave here even some sort of an ^{anonymous} appeal on the part of his colleagues in the Ukraine which could be published in the future if necessary, leave his poetry which cannot be published in the Ukraine, tell how and who should be attacked in Kiev to help him and his colleagues etc. In brief, he should properly use his sojourn in New York for common cause and even for his own sake, thinking not only about the presence ^{and others} but the future as well. Also it was mandatory that in his ^{game with} with Moscow there must be first at least a tacit understanding and synchronization between them in the Ukraine and emigration.

Subject's reply was the following:

He cannot enter into any collusion with emigration, or to be more precise with Prolog, because this would only jeopardize his position and his chances to achieve what he wanted in Kiev. He committed himself fully to his friends in the party and - added - KGB as well, because he was sure that only in alliance with them he could reach his goal. Therefore he was not going to take any ~~risks~~ whatsoever. He was not going to tell Subject who his friends in the party and the KB are and he was not going to tell him many other things for that purpose, and above all, he wants to be primarily a poet and get rid of his political involvements as soon as he will be able to afford it.

Subject was aware of the fact that the enemies of his people were going to use him. This is nothing new to him but at the same time he knows that they - in Moscow and Kiev - need him as well.

He knows his ~~prise~~ and is going to play all his cards as effectively as possible and he is sure he has good chances to win, too.

But for the same reason he cannot jeopardize in any way these chances.

It was not true as Source ~~had~~ ^{assisted} that he did not do enough to help the ~~the~~ com on cause ~~and~~ his imprisoned friends in particular. The whole year he suffered no less than those who were sentenced. Last year was for him a year of painful experience and hard decisions. He can only say one thing: even his confirmation of the arrests at the Club in New York had to be fought out, it did not come from itself, and did not come easily. Particularly that part about the request of their release. What happened at the Congress of Union of Writers of Ukraine was also not to only ^{to the credit of} DZIUBA ~~and~~ and his alike ~~credit~~ but primarily it was Subject's and his friends' job. Of course, things were very complex and many factors were involved but he could only reiterate what he had said before namely that the outcome of the Congress of Writers was quite reassuring for him.

On the other hand he does not want to say by the ~~the~~ new course of Ukrainization announced at the Congress will be easily implemented. There will be strong protest and powerful neutralization forces of Russian chauvinists and their Russified supporters. Many things will continue by inertia. It's a fact that when SHELEST told university lecturers to lecture in Ukrainian there were many among them who protested against it. But this is the chance ~~that~~ of which should be taken advantage to the utmost. And there is no other way.

SHELEST is a good man and Subject pins strong hopes on him. He is a somewhat simple, Kozak-like individual. SHCHERBYTSKYI is much more sophisticated, an intellectual, but definitely not stronger in his Ukrainian feelings than SHELEST. Subject would rather think SHELEST'S Ukrainian sentiments were stronger.

Q. As far as Subject is aware of, there have been two trials in Lvov. The one he was present at, took place in February or April 1966. The defendants were two HORYNS, ZVARYCHEVSKA, OSADCHYI, and MASKUTKO. Subject knew well HORYN Bédan who was his friend. BILYVAKA was tried in Ivano-Frankivsk, at about the same time : February - April 1966.

In Kiev were tried HRYN who had been in the meantime released and KUNNETSOVA.

A trial was also in ODESSA, Subject claimed not to know who were the defendants. As to Kharkov, there probably was no one tried.

Roxane SMISHKEVYCH was involved in trials. Now? For handing away the books.

There were demonstrations in Lvov but not as massive as Prolog had claimed in their announcements.

MONCHAR and others from the Union of Writers of Ukraine protested against the arrests or rather wanted to have explanations. Most of them were shown various documents proving the childish irresponsibility of the arrested. Subject was among those who demanded an explanation too and had much trouble because of that.

There was no provocation. Most of the arrested had behaved in such a way that there was no need for provocation.

PROLOG was not sentenced, he was still under investigation when he was released. As far as Subject was aware of he was kept till the time in Kiev.

During and after the arrests the situation in Kiev and in the Ukraine in general was very bad. There was no proof that a new wave of terror like that of 1937 would start. Moreover that the involved in arrests were warned in advance to stop their activities and some people were going to use it against them "additionally".

10. ZAHREBELNY Pavlo was a friend of Subject. When Subject was expelled from university for his participation in a demonstration, he gave him a job and helped otherwise. ZAHREBELNY was among those who demanded explanations about the arrests.

11. Neither Lina KOSTENKO nor DZIUBA Ivan were authors of the letter against Subject attacking him for his article against KRAVTSIV Bohdan. Subject did not want to name him but it was obvious he probably meant Verstiuk. Subject assured that he would take no steps to cause any harm to the author of the letter.

Subject realized that the KGB and "others" succeeded in dividing the young group in the Ukraine. Horyns went to Siberia, he himself and Pavlychko to New York, and Lina Kostenko and Dziuba were officially ostracized in Kiev. But he hoped that finally Lina and Dziuba will understand him and all will turn out all right. Subject did not approve wholeheartedly of their attitude but finally it was their business. He himself was not going to follow their suit. As he mentioned before only in alliance with those in power he would be able to promote Ukrainian affairs.

Subject stressed very emphatically the fact that it was not Dziuba or Kostenko who had written the letter against him. He read the treatise by Dziuba and thought it was good. It also probably helped in inducing latest changes in the Ukraine for the better. He did not, however, have this book here.

12. The uproar abroad about SVITLYCHNY had definitely helped to get him out of prison. Subject had also nothing against some derogatory remarks about himself in the latest commentary of Prolog on his performance at the Overseas Club. "Of course, it will help me". Moreover that he was not sure whether things would not change after his return to Kiev. Anyway, he was prepared for everything. Even for the case he might also one day land in prison. But this ^{does} not change his determination to follow "the lately chosen way".

13. According to Subject there was no one at the Ukrainian Mission in New York one could talk to. With a move off his head Subject indicated that both CHERNIAVSKY and KOCHUBEY were no good. Then Subject mentioned that he had met them here for the first time.

14. Subject wanted to know whether he was right in understanding that Source's attitude to PAVLYCHKO was "acid" and whether it was because of the latter's sins in the past. Source confirmed it and Subject commented that still PAVLYCHKO was a good boy.

Source replied that PAVLYCHKO had no reason to complain about the treatment he is getting abroad and it is hoped he will draw proper conclusions from it. In other words he won't repeat his sins from the past. Subject did not comment.

15. To Source's suggestion he would like to talk with him again tete-a-tete, Subject replied that he was not going to tell him anything more. (Incidentally, most of the factual information had to be literally dragged out of him.)

When asked what authors Subject was reading in New York he did not name them. Replying to individual questions Subject said that he did not read Halaichuk, Petlura, Lypynsky, Starosolsky and many others.

Asked whether he would like to get acquainted with the Subject replied that indeed he would like to read some socio-political authors. He would appreciate for bringing him some books when he meets with Source again. Eventually, Subject could leave books with Oryshka or Ross. "By the way do you know Oryshka?" - he asked.

Source promised to bring him some books and Subject thought they should meet again despite his very tight schedule.

Subject mentioned that he was reading "a lot" in the library "mainly Lysty Do Pryjateliv and Suchasmist", the two magazines that interested him very much.

16. When parting Subject said that he had not read Source's book as yet "but now I will have to read it".

17. BILODID Ivan was suggested by Subject as one of those who should be attacked by "abroad". As to SKABA - he was not sure. He personally disliked SKABA and knew him as "a canaille" but some of his friends in Kiev told him that actually SKABA was all right.

18. Subject stressed twice that his trip to New York he mainly owed to SHELEST.

19. Asked whose idea was it to send a Russian speaking "Ukrainian writer" by the name Ivan HAYDAYENKO as head of Soviet Ukrainian visitors to Canada in Nov 1966 and thus to make an obvious "affront" to Ukrainians, Subject replied that he did not know who organized this group. HAYDAYENKO himself was not a bad man but obviously was used by the initiators of the trip whoever they were. "So - he concluded - just draw your own conclusions".